



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

it should be borne in mind that the line drawn between the undergraduate and graduate course, like the one between the business and pre-business course, is an arbitrary one introduced to facilitate discussion. Demarcation between different parts of the curriculum is likely to be much less definite in any actual course than it is in the hypothetical one. If, as seems likely, a graduate course following the undergraduate business course is extended from one year to two, and if at the same time purely graduate courses like the one at Harvard should become three-year instead of two-year courses, the two sorts of curricula would not be far apart at the end.

WILLARD E. HOTCHKISS

EVANSTON, ILLINOIS

DISCUSSION BY R. C. MCCREA

In a consideration of basic elements in the curricula of schools of business it should not be forgotten that we, as teachers and administrators, are interested primarily in the educational product of our work. It behooves us, therefore, occasionally to turn back and to inquire just what we mean by the term "education" as applied to our problems. To me the implications of the term are reasonably clear. To be truly educational, our courses should not only afford valuable information but should yield as well a much less tangible product in the shape of social point of view, clean-cut forms and methods of expression, and trained reasoning processes which show capacity for closely knit and consecutive thinking as well as for broad generalization.

It is, of course, obvious that the sequence of studies offered students in their four undergraduate years is an important factor in determining educational results. It may not be equally obvious that this sequence may be materially affected by the form of organization which the particular school may adopt. Generally speaking, there are two main types of undergraduate school. The more common is that which builds two years of professional study on the broader general foundations of two years of general academic work. The second type is that which affords a four-year mixed course largely or entirely under the control of the teaching staff of the school of business itself. In the effort to realize general educational ends, it seems to me that the proper development of either type of school is conditional upon a recognition of advantages and of dangers incident to each type of organization.

The advantages of the two-year school would seem, in part, to be the following: The student personnel is made up of Juniors and Seniors who are more mature than are the Freshmen and Sophomores forming the main body of students in the four-year type of school. The trying and difficult process of weeding out incompetents has already, in large part, been accomplished.

As a consequence there can be closer concentration of teaching effort on definite problems of professional instruction than is usually possible in the working out of a mixed curriculum. On the other hand, the Junior who enters a school of business of the two-year type, and who has really given serious attention to the work of his two collegiate years, is quite likely to find a number of the first-year business courses altogether too simple and easy in the degree of discipline and mental maturity these require, as contrasted with the more exacting disciplinary requirements of courses taken by him in the earlier academic period. There is danger, too, in the professional concentration of the latter two years on courses having to do so largely with problems of subsequent personal pecuniary concern, that the student may forget the lessons of the earlier years in their emphasis on the social viewpoint. And, further, at this early stage in the application of the teaching art to instruction in business he may suffer also from the possibly inferior quality of our courses in developing close reasoning methods and in enhancing capacity for broad generalization, such as might well have begun to come to him from properly developed habits of application to the studies of his earlier collegiate years.

In the case of the school which controls the whole of its four-year curriculum there are possibilities of a better-balanced organization of courses than in the two-year type. These might well be arranged so that the student could proceed by proper gradations from more concrete to more general studies adapted to his growing maturity and capacity. The danger, however, is that this possibility may not be realized. The great mass of students who enter a school of business directly from high school are likely to be impatient pragmatists, who desire quickly to prepare themselves either for specific business opportunities or for any job which affords adequate pay. It is a fact that fully half of the commerce students who enter as Freshmen leave before the beginning of the Junior year. Under these conditions, there is always temptation to concede something to the pressure for detailed vocational work, to the neglect of broader, more fundamental, courses which should prepare the student not merely for wider service and further advancement in business but also for the succeeding years of a four-year course. This pressure can, of course, be resisted, and on the whole has been resisted, in most of the four-year schools. Under these conditions students can progress from the earlier courses in English, language work, commercial geography, accounting method, and the simpler aspects of business administration to more strictly professional courses in the later years, among which might well be intertwined a proper offering of courses of philosophic type, long in their range of vision as well as eminently practical in purpose and subject-matter.

Whatever our judgment may be with reference to the relative desirability or undesirability of the two types of curricular organization, one consideration strikes me as beyond controversy: that our schools should be strictly educational institutions with professional emphasis, and not merely trade schools with an indefinite ramification of descriptive courses striving to cover every

aspect of business practice from the work of the office boy to that of an industrial or commercial executive. In other words, accepting the dictum that business is a bad school of business, we must not fall into the false position of duplicating under educational auspices the minutely ramified vocational training devices suggested by the workaday world. Business itself can better train in these. We must do what business cannot do, or at least is not likely to do, for most of its workers—teach principles and relations. By clinging to these fundamentals, and by emphasizing methods of instruction and content of courses which will contribute to the developing of socially minded business men who have learned to reason closely as well as to generalize safely, we can make our schools, though strictly professional, as truly educational in their processes and results as the best of our educational institutions of any type. In a word, we must educate and train for vocational mobility, not for static vocation.

DISCUSSION BY H. S. PERSON

Dean Hotchkiss' paper is an admirable summary of principles which must guide us in determining the basic elements in the curricula of collegiate schools of business. I have a criticism of the paper, however, in that it does not get us very far. It approaches our problem from the point of view of general educational principles. Now this approach is sound and essential, but it is not sufficient and it is not new. It is an approach which must be made in a consideration of the basic elements of the curriculum of any professional school. The essential things in this paper could have been presented to a conference of schools of medicine or of law. In addition to the approach to such a problem from the point of view of general educational experience, an approach must be made also from the point of view of the professional characteristics demanded of graduates by the professional environment into which they must enter. That has not been done by this paper. I take it we have reached the point in our experience when an approach of that sort will be the new contribution. I should like to devote the little time at my disposal to suggestions which may help in that direction.

During the more than fifteen years of our efforts at the Tuck School we have been searching for the elements of a curriculum which are basic in the sense that they relate to elements in business which are universal in all business. We have come to believe that the differences between businesses which are ordinarily noted—that one manufactures or distributes shoes and another sugar; that one fashions or deals in tangible commodities and another offers services—are superficial from the educational point of view. Attention to these differences is essential but too much should not be made of them. A curriculum, the elements of which are determined by a consideration of these superficial differences, is likely to develop limitations in the graduate rather than give him professional freedom and power. Have you ever considered